



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/006,579	12/04/2001	Juan C. Colberg	PC10856A	4981

23913 7590 05/20/2003

PFIZER INC
150 EAST 42ND STREET
5TH FLOOR - STOP 49
NEW YORK, NY 10017-5612

EXAMINER

BERCH, MARK L

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1624
DATE MAILED: 05/20/2003

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Applicant No .	Applicant(s)
	10/006,579	COLBERG ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Mark L. Berch	1624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 April 2003.

2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

4) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6) Claim(s) 1-39 is/are rejected.

7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11) The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) approved b) disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a) All b) Some * c) None of:

1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____.
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____.	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 1-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, paragraphs 1 and 2, as the claimed invention is not described, or is not described in such full, clear, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to make and use the same, and/or failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as his invention. Specifically:

The claim 1 process, as written, will not produce the product as specified, and hence the claim is not correct (paragraph 2). Alternatively, the specification does not teach how to do this process (paragraph 1). The problem here is the XH in the final product of Formula 1. Example 1 exactly corresponds to the claim 1 process language, including the PCl_5 treatment at page 27, lines 26-27. The product, however, does not correspond to Formula 1 because the HX is not present. No other example gives the Formula 1 product either. The Bateson et al. reference, doing the N-deacylation on a virtually identical compound (differing only in the nature of the ester group at a remote point) does not directly obtain the salt. Either the structure of Formula 1 is not correct, or something has been left out.

The amendment is only partial solution. The remarks do not deal with the discrepancy between the example 1 product and the one which the claims require. If the examples fail to produce the product, the claims are not enabled, *Morton International Inc. v. Cardinal Chemical Co.*, 28 USPQ2d 1190.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-15, 25, 28-39, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bateson et al.

The claim 1 process is embraced by the teaching of the reference at column 11, line 41-column 12, line 19. Converting the product to a salt appears as step v) at line 65, making the salts referred to at column 2, line 20. The p-nitrobenzyl choice for R3 (for claim 28) appears at column 3, line 17, and allyl (for claim 29) is at line 18 and benzyl (for claim 30) is at line 16. The actual examples use the p-methoxybenzyl ester (e.g. 6, 13-15) or the butyl (example 1). The equivalence of the groups is clearly taught at column 3, lines 16-18, where all 5 groups are mentioned. Applicants need to show that unexpected effects arise from the use of one protecting group rather than another. Similarly, the p-methoxybenzyl and butyl esters of the 7-amino compounds of examples 1, 3, 6, 13-15 render claim 32 obvious. These fall within Formula II, differing only in the carboxyl protecting group, which is obvious for reasons set forth above, and being in the

salt form, a variation taught by column 9, line 29. In the same manner, the phenylacetamido intermediate of claim 33 is rendered obvious by the intermediates at example 6, step d; example 13, step e; examples 14-15, step d. This differs solely in the nature of the carboxyl protecting group.

Claim 2's toluene is seen in e.g. example 1, step e; example 3, etc. Claim 3's use of PCl_5 is seen in e.g. example 1, step f; example 15, step e, etc.

Claims 4 and 7 deal with the process of preparing the starting material IIIa, converting the alcohol IIIc to the halide IIIb, and reacting that with the phosphine. That appears in the reference at column 12, lines 22-48. This is exemplified in example 1 and other examples. Claim 8's thionyl chloride appears at column 18, line 38, and claim 9's lutidine appears at line 40. Claim 25's THF appears at column 12, line 41. Claim 34 is thus obvious, as such compounds are made in Example 1, step c and d; ex 3, steps d and e, example 6, steps b and c, etc. This compound has a different protecting group present, but that is obvious for reasons set forth above in the discussion of the R3 equivalences at column 3, lines 16-18, of methoxybenzyl with nitrobenzyl and allyl.

The claim 10-12 process is set forth at column 13, lines 27-50, including the use of acetone as solvent.. See examples 6, step b. The thiol intermediate at column 25, lines 29-31 renders claim 35 obvious. This compound has a different protecting group present, but that is obvious for reasons set forth above in the discussion of the R3 equivalences at column 3, lines 16-18, of methoxybenzyl with nitrobenzyl and allyl. The compound is also made in examples 14-15, step b, although it is not named there, and is made in example 27, step e.

Claims 13-15 deal with the method of preparing the thiol by cleaving the fused thiazoline compound VIa. The reference states that the thiol can be made “according to known methods” and cites specifically the Narisada method, at column 14, lines 58-62. See example 6, step b and examples 14, 15, 27, 29 etc step b. Similarly, the product of example 6, step b) renders obvious the compounds of claims 36-39. These compounds have a different protecting group present, but that is obvious for reasons set forth above in the discussion of the R3 equivalences at column 3, lines 16-18, of methoxybenzyl with nitrobenzyl and allyl.

The traverse is unpersuasive. Applicants raise three arguments:

A. Unexpected improvement in terms of “better isolation and purification.” However, evidence of unexpected effects should have been presented in the form of a proper declaration under 35 USC 132. The arguments of counsel cannot take the place of factually supported objective evidence. See, e.g., *In re Huang*, 100 F.3d 135,139-40, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1689 (Fed. Cir. 1996); *In re De Blauwe*, 736 F.2d 699, 705, 222 USPQ 191, 196 (Fed. Cir. 1984). “The reason for requiring evidence in declaration or affidavit form is to obtain the assurances that any statements or representations made are correct, as provided by 35 U.S.C. 25 and 18 U.S.C. 1001.” (MPEP 716.02(g)).

B. Applicants next argue that their protecting group can be removed with sodium dithionite, and under “mild pH adjustment” whereas the prior art protecting group cannot. However, removing protecting groups is a well understood area, and these are all expected differences, not unexpected ones. Expected differences are not evidence of unobviousness, *In re Gershon*, 372 F.2d 535, 538, 152 USPQ 602, 604 (CCPA 1967); *Ex parte Blanc*, 13 USPQ2d 1383; *In re Merck & Co.*, 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed.

Cir. 1986). Incidentally, applicants statement that utilization of paramethoxybenzyl requires the use of Palladium is untrue. Hydrogenation is a common method, but such groups have been removed by other methods, such as formic acid, or TFA.

C. Higher yields are possible with pNB in the next step. Again, no proper evidence for this has been presented.

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Mark L. Berch whose telephone number is 703-308-4718. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:15 - 3:45.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mukund Shah can be reached on 308-4716. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are 703-308-4556 for regular communications and 703-308-4556 for After Final communications.

Art Unit: 1624

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 708-308-1235.



Mark L. Berch
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1624

May 16, 2003